

Cy  
ent'y  
a pixel electrode provided on said substrate and superposed on said gate line with an insulator therebetween and superposed on said wiring with an insulator therebetween; and

at least one transistor provided on said substrate and connected with said gate line at a gate thereof and connected with said data line at one of source and drain thereof and connected with said pixel electrode at the other one of the source and drain,

wherein a capacitance between said pixel electrode and said gate line and a capacitance between said pixel electrode and said wiring are the same as each other intentionally.--

#### REMARKS

The Examiner's Official Action dated November 14, 1995 has been received and its contents carefully noted. Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of claims 1-3 and 21. Claim 4 has been cancelled, claims 5, 22 and 23 have been amended and new claim 24 has been added to more clearly define protection to which applicant is entitled. Claims 1, 5, 6 and 21-23 are independent. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-8 and 21-24 are now pending in the present application and, for the reasons set forth in detail below, are believed to be in condition or allowance.


The Official Action rejects claims 4, 5 and 22 as indefinite. In response, claim 4 has been cancelled and thus the rejection of this claim is believed moot. With respect to claim 5, this claim has been amended to correct any indefiniteness and as amended is supported by Figure 6(A) of the application. With respect to claim 22, the Official Action notes that the term "said pixel electrode" is unclear in lines 11-13 and that the phrase "the area" in line 10 lacks antecedent basis. In response, claim 22 has been amended to correct these informalities. In view of the above comments and amendments herewith, claims 5 and 22 are now believed to be in accord with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and reconsideration is requested.

The Official Action next rejects claim 23 as anticipated by Japanese Patent Document Number 60-54478. In response to Applicant's earlier arguments, the official Action asserts that it is obvious to those of skill in the art that when the drain electrode and the pixel electrode are formed of the same material and integral with each other to form a continuous one-piece element, that the drain electrode is also the pixel electrode.

In response, claim 23 has been further amended to recite that a capacitance including the gate line, the pixel electrode and the first insulator is provided intentionally. Applicant notes that it is a conventional technique to reduce a parasitic capacitance formed between a gate line and a pixel electrode. To the contrary, in accordance with the present invention as recited in claim 23, a capacitance between a gate line and a pixel electrode is intentionally provided. Thus, in view of the comments and amendments set forth herein, Applicant believes that claim 23 is patentably distinguished over the prior art of record and reconsideration is accordingly requested in view thereof.

For all of the above reasons, it is respectively asserted that claims 1-3, 5-8 and 21-24 are now in proper condition for allowance and reconsideration of the pending rejections is respectively requested. If the Examiner believes that any further discussions would be beneficial in this case, he is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Eric J. Robinson  
Reg. No. 38,285

Sixbey, Friedman, Leedom & Ferguson, P.C.  
2010 Corporate Ridge, Suite 600  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 790-9110